

## St. Joseph and Labor

*Motu Proprio of Benedict XV., Pope, for the Celebration  
of the Fiftieth Year of the Proclamation of the  
Patriarch St. Joseph as Patron of the  
Universal Church.*

**I**T was a good and salutary thing for Christian peoples that Our predecessor Pius IX., of immortal memory, solemnly decreed to the most chaste Spouse of the Virgin Mary, and Guardian of the Incarnate Word, St. Joseph, the title of Universal Patron of the Church; and as the fiftieth anniversary of this happy event will recur next December, we consider it useful and opportune that it should be worthily celebrated by the whole Catholic world.

If we cast a glance over the past fifty years We perceive a wonderful flourishing of pious institutions which bear witness to the manner in which devotion to the most holy Patriarch has been gradually developing amongst the Faithful; and if We should then consider the present-day calamities by which the human race is afflicted, the opportuneness of intensifying this devotion and of spreading it still more widely throughout Christian peoples becomes more evident. After the cruel war, We indicated in Our Encyclical "On the Reconciliation of Christian Peace" what was necessary to establish everywhere order and tranquillity, considering in particular the civil relations which exist between people and people, individuals and individuals. It has now become necessary to consider another cause of disturbance, much more serious, for it is one which has crept into the very heart of society. The scourge of war descended on the human race just at that moment when it had become deeply infected with naturalism, that great worldly pest which, wherever it enters, lessens the desire of heavenly things, extinguishes the flame of Divine Charity, and deprives man of the healing and elevating grace of Christ; leaving him without the light of faith, dependent on the weak and corrupt resources of nature, the slave of unbridled human passion. Thus it happened that many devoted themselves solely to the acquisition of worldly goods and while the contest between the wealthy and the proletariat had already become acute,

class hatred became still more grave by reason of the length and severity of the war, which, while on one side it brought intolerable privation to the masses, on the other rapidly made fortunes for the few.

It must also be added that the sanctity of conjugal fidelity and respect for paternal authority have been grievously transgressed by many during the war; the remoteness of one spouse served to relax the bond of duty in the other, and the absence of a watchful eye gave rise to freer and more indulgent conduct, more particularly amongst the younger members of the female sex. It is sincerely to be regretted that public morals have become far more corrupt and depraved than they had previously been, and for this very reason the so-called "social question" has become so serious as to cause one to fear the very worst of evils. There has been maturing in the wishes and expectations of all the seditious members of society the advent of a certain universal republic, which should be founded on the absolute equality of men and on community of goods, and in which there should no longer be national distinction, nor should any recognition be given to the authority of the father over his sons, nor of public power over the citizens, nor of God over men united in civil commonwealth. All of which are things, which, should they become actual, would cause tremendous social convulsion, such as is now being experienced and felt by not a small part of Europe. And it is precisely for the purpose of producing amongst other peoples a similar condition of things that we see the masses excited by the fury and audacity of a few, and grave disturbances in various places.

#### PATRON OF THE WORKERS

In the meantime We, pre-occupied most of all by this course of events, have not neglected whenever the occasion presented itself, to recall to the sons of the Church their duty, as We did recently by the letters addressed to the Bishop of Bergamo and to the Bishops of the Venetian province. And now, for the same motive—that is, to recall to their duty those of our own fold, how many soever they may be, who earn their bread by the labor of their hands, and to preserve them immune from the contagion of Socialism, than which nothing is more op-

posed to Christian wisdom, We, with great solicitude, place before them in a particular manner St. Joseph, that they may follow him as their special guide and honor him as their heavenly Patron.

He, in fact, lived a life similar to theirs; and for this reason Our Lord Jesus Christ, though He was the only begotten Son of the Eternal Father, wished to be called the "Son of the Carpenter." But how many and how great were the virtues with which he adorned his poor and humble condition! All the virtues which should ennoble the man who was to be the husband of Mary Immaculate, and the Foster Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Let all, then, learn from Joseph to consider present things which pass in the light of future things which will remain, and, finding consolation amid human vicissitudes in the hope of heavenly things, they may aspire to them in a manner conformable with the Divine will—that is, by living soberly, justly, and piously.

In reference to the labor problem, it is opportune to quote here the words which Our predecessor, Leo XIII, of happy memory uttered on this question, for they are such that no other words can be considered more appropriate:

From the consideration of these things the poor, and all who live by the labor of their hands, should feel themselves animated by a high sentiment of equity; though it be permitted to them to rise from a condition of want to one of well-being without any violation of justice, nevertheless both justice and reason forbid the destruction of that order which Divine Providence has ordained. On the contrary, it is foolish to descend to violence and to seek to better existing conditions by sedition and revolt, which in most cases only produce greater evil than those which they were meant to cure. If the poor wish to act wisely let them not trust the vain promises of demagogues, but let them trust in the example and patronage of St. Joseph, and in the maternal care of the Church, which daily becomes more solicitous for their well being.

With the increase of devotion to St. Joseph amongst the Faithful there will be as a necessary consequence an increase in their devotion towards the Holy Family of Nazareth, of which he was the august head, springing spontaneously as those devotions do, one from the other. For by St. Joseph we are led directly to Mary, and by Mary to the fountain of all holiness, Jesus Christ, who conse-

crated the domestic virtues by His obedience toward St. Joseph and Mary. We desire, then, that those marvelous examples of virtue should inspire and act as models for all Christian families. Thus, as the family constitutes the foundation of the human race, by strengthening domestic society with the bonds of purity, fidelity, and concord, a new vigor and, as it were, new blood shall be diffused through all the members of human society under the vivifying influence of the virtue of Christ, nor shall the result consist merely in the correction of private morals, but even in the restoration of public and civil institutions.

We, therefore, full of confidence in the patronage of him to whose providence and vigilance it pleased God to entrust His Only-begotten Son and the most holy Virgin, earnestly exhort all the Bishops of the Catholic world that in the Church's present need they should induce the Faithful to implore more earnestly the powerful intercession of St. Joseph. And as there are many ways, approved by this Apostolic See for venerating the holy Patriarch, especially on all the Wednesdays of the year and during the month consecrated to him, We wish that, at the instance of each Bishop, all those devotions, in as far as possible, should be practised in each diocese.

But as he is justly regarded as the most efficacious protector of the dying, having expired in the arms of Jesus and Mary, it shall be a special injunction to Our Venerable Brethren to assist in every possible manner those pious associations which have been instituted to obtain for the dying the intercession of St. Joseph, such as the "Association for a Happy Death" and "The Pious Union of St. Joseph's Death" for the agonizing of each day.

To commemorate the above Pontifical Decree We order and enjoin that within a year from the eighth of December next, throughout the whole Catholic world there shall be celebrated in honor of St. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, a solemn function, at whatever time and in whatever manner each Bishop shall consider fitting, and to all who assist We grant a plenary indulgence on the usual conditions.

St. Peter's, Rome, July 25th, feast of St. James, Apostle, 1920, in the sixth year of Our Pontificate.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

## Harvard and Jesuit Morality

*A Correspondence Between Professor Roger B. Merriman, of Harvard University, and the Rev. Ignatius W. Cox, S.J., of Boston College.*

March 9, 1920.

Professor Roger B. Merriman,  
175 Brattle Street,  
Cambridge, Mass.

My dear Professor Merriman:

It has been reported to me that you have been teaching in your history courses that the Jesuits hold that the end justifies the means.

Out of fairness, I am writing to you to ask if in point of fact such is your teaching. In case your answer is affirmative, would it entail too much trouble for you to furnish me with the historical basis for your assertion?

Perhaps you have not been in a position to know that before the civil courts of Trier and Cologne (1905) Hoensbroech signally failed to establish any such example of Jesuit teaching.

Thanking you in advance for the trouble you may take in answering this letter, I am

Sincerely yours,

IGNATIUS W. COX, S.J.

Cambridge, Mar. 12, '20.

Dear Professor Cox:

If you have been told that I have been telling my classes that the Jesuits hold that the end justifies the means, you have been misinformed. I always take the greatest pains to point out that it is not literally true that the Order gives its adherence to that principle; but I also try to make it clear that they not seldom acted upon it and practically defended it. I may add that I am familiar with the literature of this much-disputed subject from Busenbaum's "Medulla" down, and realize that the Order has sometimes found it convenient to repudiate the printed utterances of its members. I have, however, no desire to be drawn into further controversy on the subject.

Yours v. truly,

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

March 31, 1920.

Professor R. B. Merriman,  
175 Brattle Street,  
Cambridge, Mass.  
Dear Professor:

I have to thank you for your favor in answer to my letter. I heartily share in your disinclination to enter any controversy on the subject. But the case is not quite so simple.

Accepting your distinction between the theory and the practice of the principle, that the end justifies the means, I still feel called upon to ask for two or three historical instances where the Jesuits have practically acted on the principle in question. You will doubtless have no difficulty in supplying me with these instances, as you make it clear to your boys that such is the case.

Your assertion involves a moral imputation on the character of every Jesuit professor in Boston College. I think justice to your boys, to the Jesuits, not to speak of historical truth, requires that you furnish me with the desired proofs. I do not think the demands of fairness and right can be waived by your disinclination to furnish instances which you apparently have ready at hand, but of which I have no knowledge.

Thanking you in advance, I am

Sincerely yours,

IGNATIUS W. Cox, S.J.

---

Cambridge, Mass.

April 21st, 1920.

Dear Professor Cox:

There is an *embarras de richesses*, it seems to me, of historical instances to prove that the Jesuits have often acted on the principle that the end justifies the means. A couple of obvious ones may be found in Lavissee and Rambaud's "*Histoire Générale*," volume 6, pp. 284-85 (Meynier's views on the execution of the Edict of Nantes), and in Lavissee, "*Histoire de France*," volume 6, part I, p. 396 (The examination of Jean Châtel). But I have little hope that you will accept these or any of a hundred others that I might mention, as conclusive; that is what I

meant when I expressed in my previous letter my belief that it was perfectly futile for us to correspond on the matter. The point at issue, from its very nature, is one on which no Jesuit can get from or give to a non-Jesuit any real or permanent satisfaction.

There is, however, another instance which I ran across the other day that I cannot forbear to call to your attention, since you expressed in your previous letter such a high respect for the German Civil Courts of Treves and Cologne. It comes from the autobiography of Cardinal Bellarmine, edited by Döllinger and Reusch (Bonn, 1887), so that you certainly cannot accuse it of Protestant bias. It is the passage covered on pages 200-209, especially pages 205-06, dealing with the justifiability of lying to magistrates when the safety and interests of the Catholics are at stake. In case you do not possess the volume, I shall be pleased to show it to you here.

The pity of it all, if I may be so bold as to say so, is that your rules and discipline make it necessary for you to regard my assertion as involving a "moral imputation on the character of every Jesuit professor in Boston College." No sane Protestant would deny that Martin Luther lied despicably and sinned atrociously in that most unsavory affair of the double marriage of Philip of Hesse ("The secret 'Yea' must for the sake of Christ's Church refrain a public 'Nay'"); all reasonable Protestants admit this, and make no effort at defense. Moreover, there are many others than the Jesuits who act on the principle that the end justifies the means. To a certain extent we all do, I suppose; but as we diverge absolutely as to what the end is, there is immense difference in the lines of conduct we actually pursue.

\* As I said before, I have little or no hope that this correspondence will give either of us any permanent satisfaction. If you think that I am affected by any anti-Catholic bias in my teaching, you are utterly and absolutely wrong; in fact, if anything, my tendency, though I am a good Protestant, is exactly the other way. On the other hand, my respect for historical truth forces me to point out the good and bad of both sides impartially, and I unconditionally refuse to slide over the black spots in the



history of the Society of Jesus, just as I do not omit to bear tribute to its many noble and heroic deeds.

Very truly yours,

R. B. MERRIMAN.

---

May 5, 1920.

Professor Roger B. Merriman,  
Cambridge,  
Massachusetts.

Dear Professor Merriman:

I am in hearty accord with your respect for historical truth, which forces you to point out the good and bad of both sides impartially. It was the position of Leo XIII, when he threw open the Vatican Library to Pastor.

My discussion with you is: precisely what is the black spot with regard to the Jesuits? The Society of Jesus has nothing to fear from an impartial statement of historical truth. What she does deplore are insinuations, interpretations, generalizations from particular instances, impressions created above and beyond historical truth, and the poisoning of the wells in the advice, "never to dispute with a Jesuit."

How you arrive at the conclusion that I am forced by my rules and discipline to interpret your previous remarks as "a moral imputation on the character of every Jesuit professor teaching at Boston College" escapes my intelligence. Would you kindly tell me what those rules and discipline are? I am unaware of them though I have been a member of the Society for eighteen years. Nothing else brought me to such a conclusion except the force and logic of your words.

You cited a magnificent instance of one acting on the principle that the end justifies the means in the case of Luther and Philip of Hesse. Would that justify me, even though I had ten other such instances, in making a general statement that Lutherans frequently act on the principle that the end justifies the means, as if such action flowed from principles inherent in Lutheranism? To be historically impartial and correct, I should say, that some who were Lutherans have acted frequently on the principle that the end justifies the means. But you, basing your



opinion on particular historical instances, which, you say that you have, make it plain to your boys that the *Jesuits* act frequently on the principle that the end justifies the means, as if it flowed from the fact of being a Jesuit. How else, then, could I consider your remarks except as involving a moral imputation on the character of the professors at Boston College?

Nor will I permit myself to be included in your generalization that to a certain extent we all act on the principle that the end justifies the means. It is *never* permitted to use means intrinsically wrong, to lie, to steal, to murder, or to pervert historical truth, to attain an end though good in itself. Such I have ever been taught. Such is a fundamental principle of St. Ignatius in the book of the *Spiritual Exercises*, that not for all created things, not even for life itself, should one deliberate on the commission of even a slight evil which is intrinsically wrong.\* (*"Exercitia Spiritualia, 2nda Hebdomada, De Tribus Gradibus Humilitatis."*) Such is the doctrine of Jesuit moralists, ascetics, and preachers. Upon such a principle have the lives of Jesuit saints and martyrs been formed. If I should perform an act intrinsically wrong, should tell a single lie to achieve an end however good, I would not be acting as a Jesuit, but I would be acting contrary to the principles and spirit of a Jesuit in every sense. Yet you say that the Jesuits frequently act on the principle that the end justifies the means, as if it were something inherent in the fact of being a Jesuit. That you think it flows from the fact of being a Jesuit is evidenced by your opinion that it constitutes a black spot on the Society. To act thus is contrary to the spirit imbibed by every Jesuit. To be historically correct and impartial, what you should say, provided you can prove it, is that some, who were Jesuits, acted upon the principle, and not as Jesuits, but contrary to the spirit of the Jesuit Order. To say, as you have said, that Jesuits act frequently on the principle that the end justifies the means, is not only to create a *false* impression, but is in itself false and contrary to *impartial*

---

\*More explicitly still, all Jesuit moralists teach that all evil acts, whether intrinsically or extrinsically wrong, are unlawful.

historical truth, and constitutes a grave injustice to the Society.

I wish also to call attention to the inconsistency of your remark that "There are many others who act on the principle that the end justifies the means. To a certain extent we all do." If that is so, why do you hold it up as a particular accusation against the Jesuits? Do you mention this to your boys, namely, that we all to a certain extent act on this principle, when you give them the impression that it constitutes a particular accusation against the Jesuits?

And now I come to the historical instances which you cited. I do not accept them as conclusive, nor do I think any impartial historian would. Take the case of Jean Châtel, a fanatic, morbidly brooding over an impure past, trembling over punishment to come, and seeking to lighten his future punishment by the assassination of Henry IV. What does this instance prove? It proves that a deluded fanatic acted on the principle that the end justifies the means. It can never be distorted as a proof that a Jesuit so acted.

Why you cite the instance of Meynier in proof of your thesis, entirely escapes me. His words involve a purely legal argument which is plausible and objective. How does it prove that a Jesuit acted on the principle that the end justifies the means? If the other instances from your *embarras de richesses* are like the two already cited, I greatly fear that your *embarras de richesses* will eventuate into real poverty.

I have not yet obtained a copy of the autobiography of Bellarmine, but expect to do so in a few days when I shall go over to New York.

But let me call your attention to this fact. Döllinger ceased to be a Catholic in 1871. Not only from the Catholic standpoint, he was from that time anti-Catholic, but it would seem that he also had an *anti-Jesuit twist* because of the activities of the Jesuits in the declaration of papal infallibility. The writer of the article on Bellarmine in "The Catholic Encyclopedia" declares with regard to the notes of Döllinger and Reusch that their general tone is unfair and spiteful.

But I see that the difference between us lies even deeper than history. It is psychological. It is built up on an entirely wrong idea wherever obtained of what a Jesuit really is. Your idea that the question between us is one upon which no Jesuit can give a non-Jesuit satisfaction is absolutely false. Your concept of a Jesuit being led this way and that way in his thinking by a set of rules and a discipline, which in some mysterious way do his thinking for him, is equally untrue. I say sincerely, with no attempt at sarcasm, that one would imagine from the tone of your letters, that you really felt that you knew more about the Jesuits than I do. I am bold enough to say that I think you should seek some interpretation of the Jesuit of the past by the Jesuit of the living present, and that your generous labors in search of historical truth will not suffer in consequence.

These are days of round-table conferences in industrial disputes, and I believe that the principle could be applied to the historical field with good results. I should be glad to entertain you at University Heights to explain to you whatever you care to know about the Society of Jesus. I spent a pleasant hour with Professor Bullock last fall, whom I would be pleased to meet again in your company.

Respectfully,

IGNATIUS W. Cox, S.J.

---

175 Brattle St.,  
Cambridge, Mass  
May 17, 1920

Dear Professor Cox:

Yours of May 5th brings us back to just where we started, which, if you will remember was just what I prophesied (*sic*) would occur. I give you some instances, which are amply sufficient to prove my point in the estimation of everyone to whom I showed them here; but you do not accept them as such. I never supposed you would. It is just as it was in the days of Escobar and Pascal. The former convinced the Jesuits and many Catholics; the latter pretty well everybody else.

Under the circumstances, I can see no useful end in continuing our controversy. I have no hope of convincing

you; and I am certain that you will never convince me. With much regret, I must decline your kind invitation to University Heights.

Yours truly,

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

June 2, 1920.

Professor Roger B. Merriman,  
175 Brattle Street,  
Cambridge, Mass.

My dear Professor:

Your letter of May 17th, from a dialectical standpoint, was most unsatisfactory. It purports to be an answer to my letter of May 5th, but it carefully and for obvious reasons avoids answering anything. In my letter of May 5th, I made clear to you:

First, that particular instances, even if you have them, do not justify you in making a general accusation that the Jesuits as Jesuits act on the principle that the end justifies the means.

Secondly, I proved by positive reference that no Jesuit could act on the principle in question, if the means were intrinsically wrong, without acting contrary to every principle of Jesuit morality.

Thirdly, I called your attention to the fact that you include yourself among those who act on this principle, which I repudiate for myself and for every Jesuit; wherefore, you are proved guilty of grave inconsistency.

Fourth, I gave reasons which clearly showed why and wherefore the instances you advanced do not prove the point under discussion.

It is dialectically pathetic that in a matter that involves a serious charge against the Society of Jesus you in your last letter absolutely ignore points one, two and three. The reason, of course, is obvious. There is no answer which you can make to them. As to the fourth point, ignoring my reason for rejecting your references, you satisfy yourself by saying that they proved sufficiently to those to whom you showed them. I submit that an appeal to self-chosen arbitrators in a case like this is valueless. To sum up, you close the controversy by a reiteration of your

original accusation and by ignoring my carefully stated arguments together with the most fundamental principles of controversy. For you to persist in making what constitutes a grave charge against a reputable body of men, in spite of your inability to defend with even a fair degree of probability the general thesis under discussion, is a sad commentary on men and methods in the modern teaching of history. The distinguished historian who said that history in the last three hundred years has been a conspiracy against the truth had much, it would seem, with which to substantiate his position. Wrong interpretation of facts is quite as bad as interpolation of facts.

Your attempt to insert at this stage of the discussion the names of Pascal and Escobar is another example of what seems to me, unfairness. In your last letter you say, "It is just as it was in the days of Escobar and Pascal. The former convinced the Jesuits and many Catholics; the latter convinced pretty well everybody else." Convinced them of what? We are discussing a definite accusation made by you that Jesuits as Jesuits act frequently on the principle that the end justifies the means. Your reference to Pascal and Escobar means nothing unless you can make them prove *this* thesis. Besides, let me point out to you that your so-called references against the Jesuits have been, it would seem, consistently taken from the enemies of the Society of Jesus, and from two historical periods, that of the Huguenot struggle and the Jansenistic controversy, when men's feelings ran high and much of what was written was partisan literature. The unprejudiced historian goes farther afield. He balances the statements of friend and foe. I gave you an opportunity for a frank discussion of this matter with me, but evidently you prefer partisan sources. So let it be.

Before I close this controversy, I must disagree with you still once again. You say that my last letter of May 5th "brings us back to just where we started." Pardon me, but we are very far from just where we started. I had little expectation that I would succeed in gaining you to admit the unfairness of your accusation. Our controversy, however, has brought to light several facts which are too valuable not to recall:

First, you do not teach that the Jesuits hold in theory the principle that the end justifies the means.

Second, what you do teach is that the Jesuits as Jesuits frequently act on the principle that the end justifies the means.

Third, you immediately try to prove number two, a general proposition, by the proof of particulars.

Fourth, your proofs of the particular are, it would seem, taken from sources inimical to the Society of Jesus.

Fifth, your alleged proofs of particulars fail to show an undoubted instance of a Jesuit acting on the principle that the end justifies the means.

Sixth, you make this astonishing admission, "moreover, there are many others than the Jesuits who act on the principle that the end justifies the means. To a certain extent *we* all do I suppose, but as we diverge absolutely as to what the end is, there is an immense difference in the lines of conduct we actually pursue."

Seventh, you are inconsistent in classing yourself among those who to a certain extent act on the principle that the end justifies the means whilst you denounce the supposed conduct of the Jesuits along the same lines.

Eighth, by a convenient form of dialectics, you ignore my arguments, reiterate your accusation, and call off the controversy.

Ninth, you refuse to meet me and allow me to give further proof, from the institute and spirit of the Society, of how utterly false the accusation is.

Tenth, you mention certain rules and discipline by which I am forced to think in a certain way, and when I challenge you to point out the rules and the discipline, you maintain a discreet silence.

I cannot, therefore, consent to your plea that we are just where we started. You are evidently determined to continue your unfair allegations against the Society. I am willing to let fair-minded men judge between us. I am, therefore, sure that you will have no objection to my intention to publish our correspondence. You have merely attempted to justify to me the public accusation you have made against the Society of which I have the honor of being a member. Your justification is absolutely inadequate. I am ready to let impartial men judge of the case

by an examination of the correspondence which has passed between us.

In closing this controversy, I should like to say that in my public utterances in the future I shall call attention, on fitting occasions, as to how Catholic matters are handled in at least one course at Harvard in order that your attempt to perpetuate what I consider an historical calumny may fail of its effect.

Respectfully yours,

IGNATIUS W. COX, S.J.

## Ireland's Right to Independence

PRESIDENT DE VALERA.

*From the Toronto "Statesman"*

FOR over one thousand years Ireland possessed and fully exercised sovereign independence, and was recognized throughout Europe as a distinct sovereign State. The hope of recovering full and permanent sovereignty has always lived in the breasts of the Irish people, and has been the mainspring and the inspiration of their political activities. All liberty-loving nations of the world owe to the Irish the recognition of the independence of Ireland, not only because of the indisputable right of the people of Ireland to govern their own destinies, but also because that right is denied by England on grounds which are a negation of national liberty everywhere, and entirely subversive of international peace and order.

England being a maritime power, dependent for safety on her navy, because of the proximity of Ireland deems it a practical necessity to dominate Ireland. Ireland is not as near to England as Belgium, or Holland or France is to Germany, or Norway is to Sweden, or as Portugal is to Spain. Yet, England resists Ireland's demand for independence on the ground that a free Ireland is incompatible with the security of England, or Great Britain, or of the British Empire. On such a ground the subjugation of any small nation by a neighboring great power could be justified. Basing its action on the pattern of England, a State could claim the right to suppress the independence of any nation whose continued liberty that State declared incompatible with its own security.



This very proximity makes independence essential to Ireland, if Irish rights are to be sacrificed to English interests. Ireland, according to the British Navy League, is merely a naval out-port to be governed for the benefit of its foreign masters. English prosperity being dependent on her maritime commerce, Ireland's national harbors, the best in Europe, are kept empty of mercantile shipping, except such as carries the restricted trade between Ireland and Great Britain. Ireland cannot admit that the interests of one country, be they what they may, shall be allowed to annul the national rights of another country. If England be justified in this respect, there is an end to the national rights, and all nations must be prepared either to submit to armed interests or to make war against them.

English rule has never been for the benefit of Ireland, has never been intended for the benefit of Ireland. It has done all in its power to isolate Ireland from Europe and America, to retard her development, and to deprive her of a national civilization. So far as Ireland is lacking in internal peace, is behind other countries in education and material progress, is limited in her contributions to the common civilization of mankind, these defects are the visible consequence of English intrusion and domination. The English temper towards the cause of Irish national liberty has produced intolerable results in Ireland. Chief of these results are depopulation, and destruction of industries and commerce; overtaxation; diversion of rents, savings, and surplus incomes from Ireland to England; obstruction of economic development and social improvement; exploitation for the benefit of English capital; fomenting of religious animosities; repression of national culture; keeping Ireland "under the microscope" by a monstrous system of police rule; perversion of justice; subservience as the price of admission to the judiciary; corruption of the jury system; organized espionage, perjury, and provoked crime; and military government.

"The government of a people by itself," wrote John Stuart Mill ("Representative Government," c. xviii.), "has a meaning and a reality; but such a thing as the government of one people by another does not and cannot exist." Consequently, the people of England depute the power they hold over Ireland to a succession of satraps,

military and civil, who are quite irresponsible and independent of popular control, English or Irish, and who represent no interest of the Irish people.

#### APPLYING AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

Ireland's complete liberation must follow upon the application of America's principles. The rejection of these principles is implied in the refusal to recognize Ireland's right of self-determination. We adhere to the numerous declarations by which America's President has emphasized the persistence of an evident principle running through the whole program he has outlined. "It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Unless this principle be made its foundation, no part of the structure of international justice can stand."

If England objects to the application of this principle in the settlement of the case of Ireland, England thereby testifies that her international policy is based on her own selfish interests and not on the recognition of the rights of others; that in her future dealings with other nations she may be expected, when opportunity arises, to make her interests prevail over others' rights; and that she means to rule Ireland and other countries, and to possess secure both naval and mercantile domination in all seas, but especially in the North Atlantic.

Through a general election Ireland has already demonstrated her will. The Irish people are thoroughly capable of taking immediate charge of their national and international affairs. They are at least not less capable than any of the peoples endowed with national status since the beginning of the war. By a procedure not less valid than has been held good elsewhere, they have constituted a National Government. Ireland's restoration to the society of free nations will be a warrant of the good faith of the new international order and a reassurance to all the smaller nations. It will be an earnest to other peoples if justice to Ireland be not "denied or sold or delayed," that England's naval power is not hostile to the rights and legitimate interests of other countries.

Ireland's voice in the council of the nations will be wholly in favor of peace and justice. Her liberty cannot infringe on that of any other people. She will not make or favor any war of aggression. The prosperity to which she looks forward confidently, fortified by the memory of her unexampled progress during a brief period of legislative, but not executive, independence (1782-1798), will contribute to the prosperity of all countries in relations with her.

The ambition of Ireland will be to recreate that period of her ancient independence of which she is proudest, when she gave freely of her great treasures to every nation within her reach, and entertained no thought of recompense or of selfish advantage. And in proportion as England gives earnest of disinterestedness and goodwill, in like proportion will Ireland show her readiness to join in making the past pass into history.

---

## Catholic Parents' Obligations

EVERY Catholic father knows that he is bound to lead the soul of his child to God. Can he possibly fulfill that obligation by sending the child to a school which has dispensed with God? For such, precisely, is the nature of "secular education," "non-sectarian education," using the term "education" by the courtesy of usage only, since there can be no true education without a knowledge of God. Let us forget for the moment the palatial buildings, paid for in part by Catholic money, of the public school, along with such well-founded claims of efficiency in teaching as it possesses, and its prated pretensions. Stripped bare of all sham, non-sectarian education means an education from which all mention of God, save perhaps as a myth or a superstition, has been sedulously eliminated. It means that in a system which, by supposition at least, prepares the child for life in its fullest sense, no reference to God as man's Creator and last end may be tolerated. It is a training founded on the principle that revelation has no more place in the formation of the child; that faith is an emotion, and reli-

gion as purely a matter of natural preference as one's taste in automobiles or neckties; that man can attain perfection by himself, without help or hindrance from the supernatural; in short, that since man is self-sufficient, and therefore independent, the question of God's existence is at most only a matter of curious speculation.

Truth can never tolerate error. In these days of weakening faith there is a tendency to "tone down" the attitude of the Church towards purely secular education. "It is constantly asserted," writes a Catholic essayist, "that Catholics are opposed to the public school system of America. On the contrary, Catholics approve \* \* \* the public schools." If they do, it is in defiance, or in ignorance, of the Catholic attitude, expressed very forcibly by Pius IX, in condemning the proposition that "Catholics may approve of the system of educating youth, unconnected with Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which regards the knowledge of merely natural things, and, only, or at least primarily, the ends of earthly social life."

"Daily experience has demonstrated beyond doubt," is the pronouncement of the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, "how grave are the evils, and how deep-seated the dangers to which Catholic children in this country are frequently exposed by attending the public schools." The Fathers of the Third Council speak in the same sense. "It follows naturally, and is proved by sad experience," they write, "that an education merely secular so degenerates by degrees, that it becomes irreligious and impious, and pernicious in the extreme to the Faith and morals of the young." "It is of the highest importance," counsels Leo XIII in the Constitution "*Nobilissima Gallorum Gens*," "that the children of Christian parents be instructed in due time in the principles of religion, and that the training by which youth is advanced in knowledge and culture be joined with religion." "Full of danger," writes the same Pontiff in the Constitution on the Centenary of Blessed Peter Canisius, "is that educational system in which there is either a false religion, or, as is usual in the schools termed 'mixed,' no religion at all."

Let no one rashly conclude that piety can be safely excluded from education. For if at no time in life may the duties of religion be set aside, either in public or private affairs, much less should that age so devoid of experience, so inconsiderate in thought and action, and exposed to the allurements of corruption, be removed from the influence of religion. . . . Not only is it necessary that certain hours be assigned for religious instruction, but the whole system should be redolent of Christian piety. If this be wanting, if this sacred inspiration does not pervade and guide the minds of teachers and pupils, little profit will be drawn from any training, and dangers of no small moment will often follow.

In keeping with this doctrine, the three Plenary Councils of Baltimore have condemned the public school as dangerous to the Faith and morals of the Catholic child.